

Appn No. 10/659,029
Am'd. Dated November 25, 2004
Response to Office action of September 22, 2004

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The objections and submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have carefully been considered and it is submitted that distinguishing features are present in the invention.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2, 7 and 10 on the basis of them being anticipated by the disclosure in Wen et al. (US 6,082,853).

The Applicant is somewhat confused by the raised objection. The patent of Wen et al. refers to a computerized inkjet printing apparatus, which is very different from the single-substrate integrated circuit defined in the claims of the present invention. From the description col. 3 in Wen et al., it is clear that Figure 1 refers to a complex apparatus including separate devices and not to a single integrated circuit. Furthermore, each of these devices is a multi-component system. For example, as indicated in lines 30-34 of col. 2 "The computer 20 can include a microprocessor, a memory, a monitor, a user interface and electronic control of the print heads 31-34". Obviously, the microprocessor is part of the computer system and is independent from the print heads 31-34 and the ink reservoirs 31-44. Thus, the computer interface for controlling the print heads, referred to by the Examiner as "the big arrow in figure 1", is in fact an external interface connection between the computer 20 and the print heads 31-34, and not a substrate integrated data bus.

The Applicant further draws to the Examiner's attention the fact that the "halftoner" is defined in claim 1 of the present invention as a physical feature within the integrated circuit. In contrast, the element in the disclosure of Wen et al., referred to by the Examiner as an equivalent feature, is software stored in the memory of the computer 20.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that comparison of the computerized system disclosed in Wen et al. with an integrated circuit fabricated on a single substrate is entirely inappropriate since it ignores the fact that the elements disclosed there are part of a multi-component system and are not included in a single substrate. Accordingly, it is submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Wen et al. Furthermore, because of their dependence on a patentable claim, the rest of the claims are also now patentable.

Appn No. 10/659,029
And. Dated November 25, 2004
Response to Office action of September 22, 2004

3

Allowable subject Matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the useful comments in this section.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner wishes to maintain his objection to the invention, he is invited to substantiate the objection by providing specific references to the disclosure that indicates that components equivalent to the elements defined in claim 1 are not only present, but they are also included in an integrated circuit fabricated on a single substrate. Alternatively, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Faxsimile: +61 2 9555 7762